

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF IDAHO POWER )  
COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR ) CASE NO. IPC-E-21-17  
AUTHORITY TO INCREASE ITS RATES )  
FOR ELECTRIC SERVICE TO RECOVER )  
COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE JIM )  
BRIDGER POWER PLANT. )

---

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MATTHEW T. LARKIN

1 Q. Please state your name, business address, and  
2 present position with Idaho Power Company ("Idaho Power" or  
3 "Company").

4 A. My name is Matthew T. Larkin. My business  
5 address is 1221 West Idaho Street, Boise, Idaho 83702. I  
6 am employed by Idaho Power as the Revenue Requirement  
7 Senior Manager in the Regulatory Affairs Department.

8 Q. Please describe your educational background.

9 A. I received a Bachelor of Business  
10 Administration degree in Finance from the University of  
11 Oregon in 2007. In 2008, I earned a Master of Business  
12 Administration degree from the University of Oregon. I  
13 have also attended electric utility ratemaking courses,  
14 including the *Electric Rates Advanced Course*, offered by  
15 the Edison Electric Institute, and *Estimation of*  
16 *Electricity Marginal Costs and Application to Pricing*,  
17 presented by National Economic Research Associates, Inc.

18 Q. Please describe your work experience with  
19 Idaho Power.

20 A. I began my employment with Idaho Power as a  
21 Regulatory Analyst in January 2009. As a Regulatory  
22 Analyst I, I provided support for the Company's regulatory  
23 activities, including compliance reporting, financial  
24 analysis, and the development of revenue forecasts for  
25 regulatory filings.



1 Q. How is the Company's case organized?

2 A. My testimony begins with a discussion of why  
3 the depreciable date of 2030 for the Bridger plant is  
4 appropriate and describes why the Bridger depreciation  
5 schedule for ratemaking purposes should be accelerated at  
6 this time. My testimony then details the proposed  
7 balancing account intended to recover incremental costs and  
8 benefits associated with Idaho Power's assumed exit of  
9 participation of operations at Bridger in 2030 and  
10 concludes with a quantification of the proposed \$30.83  
11 million increase to rates with a requested effective date  
12 of December 1, 2021, and a summary of why the Company's  
13 request is in the public interest.

14 The direct testimony of Company witness Ryan N.  
15 Adelman presents the changes to Bridger's position in Idaho  
16 Power's generation portfolio from the Second Amended 2019  
17 Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP") reflecting the Company's  
18 exit from operations in 2030 that determined the proposed  
19 depreciable life of Bridger. Mr. Adelman then discusses the  
20 necessary actual investments made at the Bridger plant that  
21 have added to the associated plant balances since December  
22 31, 2011, and those necessary future investments to the  
23 plant that will ensure Bridger continues to be available  
24 for safe, reliable load service through the end of 2030.

25 Q. Do you have any exhibits?

1           A.       Yes. Exhibit No. 1 to my testimony details  
2 the derivation of the levelized revenue requirement  
3 calculations by cost category to be tracked in the Bridger  
4 balancing account and the Idaho jurisdictional share of the  
5 revenue requirement that the Company is proposing to  
6 include in customer rates. Exhibit No. 2 details the  
7 derivation of the Idaho jurisdictional share of the Bridger  
8 revenue requirement currently included in customer rates as  
9 approved in Case Nos. IPC-E-11-08 and GNR-U-18-01.

10                   **II. BRIDGER ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION**

11           Q.       Why is the Company proposing to modify the  
12 depreciable life of Bridger at this time?

13           A.       Pursuant to Commission Staff's recommendation  
14 in Case No. IPC-E-03-07, Idaho Power is to file an updated  
15 depreciation study within five years of the Company's  
16 previous depreciation study. Idaho Power's most recent  
17 update, filed October 21, 2016, in Case No. IPC-E-16-23 and  
18 approved with Order No. 33770, went into effect on June 1,  
19 2017. Because nearly five years have passed since the last  
20 update, the Company began preparations in early 2021 to  
21 file a new depreciation study. Through these preparations,  
22 Idaho Power recognized that the Second Amended 2019 IRP  
23 identified significant changes with regard to the economic  
24 life of the Bridger plant, warranting the need for specific  
25 review separate from the Company's general depreciation

1 filing. Given the requirement to file an updated  
2 depreciation study this year, Idaho Power believes it is  
3 appropriate to consider Bridger-related issues concurrently  
4 with the comprehensive depreciation study filed in Case No.  
5 IPC-E-21-18.

6 Q. Why does Idaho Power believe it is appropriate  
7 to address the depreciation of Bridger in a separate  
8 proceeding rather than through the general depreciation  
9 study update filed in Case No. IPC-E-21-18?

10 A. As discussed in detail in Mr. Adelman's  
11 testimony, circumstances surrounding the Bridger plant have  
12 changed since the Company last updated its depreciation  
13 rates in 2017, resulting in the Company's request for the  
14 proposed accounting treatment detailed in my testimony.  
15 Similar to the circumstances surrounding the North Valmy  
16 power plant ("Valmy") in 2017, changing conditions have  
17 resulted in an expected exit from participation in  
18 operations of Bridger that is several years earlier than  
19 what is currently reflected in customer rates. Given the  
20 complexity associated with the acceleration of Bridger's  
21 depreciation schedule and the implementation of the  
22 proposed cost recovery mechanism, the Company felt that a  
23 separate proceeding was appropriate to allow for full  
24 review of the issues presented herein.

1           Q.       What are the benefits of implementing a cost  
2 recovery mechanism for the Bridger plant at this time?

3           A.       Unlike the majority of the Company's assets  
4 that depreciate over a lifecycle that corresponds with  
5 their respective technical useful lives, Idaho Power's coal  
6 plants have transitioned in recent years to having a  
7 lifespan largely dictated by economic and regulatory  
8 factors. Because the economic and regulatory factors that  
9 will determine the Bridger plant's actual operating life  
10 are likely to shift and change over the next several years,  
11 it is important to put in place now a cost recovery  
12 mechanism that can mitigate the rate volatility that could  
13 otherwise exist under a more traditional ratemaking  
14 approach. As I will describe later in my testimony, the  
15 proposed Bridger cost recovery mechanism will levelize or  
16 smooth recovery of Bridger-related revenue requirements  
17 over its remaining operating life and help to mitigate the  
18 rate impact of any unforeseen changes in economics or  
19 regulatory policy. Further, because Idaho Power is a joint  
20 minority owner in the plant, these same factors may lead to  
21 differing operating plans between the partners that must be  
22 resolved through future negotiations. The ultimate outcome  
23 of those negotiations and their impact on operating life  
24 and cost is not known today. Putting in place the proposed  
25 cost recovery mechanism now will establish a framework for

1 cost recovery that maintains a relatively stable level of  
2 annual recovery, even though the underlying cost drivers  
3 may change over time.

4 Q. What is Bridger's currently approved  
5 depreciable life for ratemaking purposes?

6 A. Currently approved depreciation rates reflect  
7 a plant life of 60 years, with a probable retirement year  
8 of 2034.

9 Q. What analysis led Idaho Power to determine  
10 that exit from participation in operations at Bridger  
11 should be accelerated to year-end 2030?

12 A. As detailed in the direct testimony of Mr.  
13 Adelman, Idaho Power's preferred portfolio from the Second  
14 Amended 2019 IRP included early Bridger unit exits in 2022,  
15 2026, 2028 and 2030, concluding the earlier exit from  
16 Bridger would provide a more favorable economic outcome as  
17 compared to the previous depreciable life assumption of  
18 2034. In addition, while they differ from Idaho Power's  
19 exit dates, the Company's co-owner in Bridger, PacifiCorp,  
20 identified exit dates beginning in 2023 in their 2019 IRP  
21 (Case No. PAC-E-19-16), providing additional indication  
22 that all units of the Bridger plant will not be operational  
23 through 2034.

24 Q. You indicated the Company is proposing a  
25 depreciable life date of year-end 2030. Did Idaho Power

1 consider utilizing a depreciable life date for each unit  
2 that corresponds to the exit date of the unit?

3 A. Yes. However, with exit dates approaching and  
4 decommissioning costs that will be incurred on the horizon,  
5 Idaho Power believes a depreciable life of year-end 2030  
6 for all units is appropriate as it will help minimize  
7 revenue requirement impacts to customers. In addition,  
8 accelerating the depreciation schedule at this time will  
9 more appropriately match the cost recovery with Idaho  
10 Power's participation in operation of the plant, rather  
11 than a unit-by-unit approach. This method is similar to  
12 the Commission-approved cost recovery treatment for Valmy,  
13 whereby depreciation expense recovery for both of the two  
14 units goes through 2028, even though Idaho Power's  
15 participation in each unit will have ceased in different  
16 years (2019 and 2025).<sup>1</sup>

17 Q. Please explain how the acceleration of  
18 Bridger's depreciation schedule and associated adjustment  
19 to customer's rates minimizes revenue requirement impacts.

20 A. From a ratemaking perspective, depreciation  
21 expense represents the recovery of investment in plant and  
22 equipment over time. When the depreciable life of an asset  
23 is not adjusted timely to reflect an economic life, it  
24 results in a shorter time period over which costs can be

---

<sup>1</sup> Case No. IPC-E-16-24, Order No. 33771.

1 recovered, meaning more costs must be recovered in each  
2 year to provide for full recovery of the investment over  
3 its useful life. Therefore, the more time that passes  
4 before the depreciation schedule at Bridger is adjusted to  
5 reflect the 2030 exit date, the larger the revenue  
6 requirement increase will be to allow for full cost  
7 recovery.

8 Q. What are the components of this filing that  
9 result in changes to the Bridger-related revenue  
10 requirement?

11 A. As I will explain later in my testimony, the  
12 Company is proposing to include in the annual levelized  
13 revenue requirement, actual investments made at Bridger  
14 since Idaho Power filed its last general rate case, as well  
15 as forecasted investments through 2030, with an accelerated  
16 depreciable life. In addition, the Company is proposing to  
17 include operations and maintenance ("O&M") expense savings  
18 and the estimated decommissioning costs through 2030  
19 resulting in an increase in customer rates of \$30.83  
20 million to reflect a new levelized revenue requirement.  
21 Delaying the acceleration of the depreciation of the  
22 Bridger investments made and forecasted through 2030, would  
23 require a shorter time frame over which Idaho Power would  
24 need to recover its costs, increasing the rate impact to  
25 customers.

1           Q.       How does the Company's proposal result in the  
2 appropriate matching of costs and rate recovery?

3           A.       Customers will continue to be served by the  
4 Bridger plant in some capacity until year-end 2030. By  
5 accelerating the depreciation schedule to reflect a 2030  
6 exit date, the recovery of Bridger-related costs will more  
7 closely align with the remaining operating life of the  
8 plant, resulting in cost recovery from customers who are  
9 served by the plant. Without accelerating the depreciation  
10 schedule to reflect the 2030 exit date, cost recovery from  
11 customers could extend beyond the point at which the  
12 Company is participating in Bridger's operations, resulting  
13 in cost recovery from future customers for a plant that  
14 will no longer be providing service to them at that time.

15          Q.       Idaho Power is the parent company of Idaho  
16 Energy Resources Co., a joint venture in Bridger Coal  
17 Company, which mines coal at the Bridger coal mine and  
18 processing facility. Does Idaho Power's request in this  
19 case include costs associated with the accelerated  
20 depreciation of the Bridger coal mine as well?

21          A.       No. The Company is not proposing any changes  
22 to recovery of Bridger coal mine costs at this time as the  
23 existing depreciation schedule of the mine currently aligns  
24 with the expected closure date.

25        ///

1           **III.   REGULATORY ACCOUNTING AND RATEMAKING TREATMENT**

2           Q.       Please describe the need for the Bridger  
3 balancing account.

4           A.       As discussed earlier, Idaho Power believes it  
5 will exit operations of Bridger by 2030, earlier than the  
6 current depreciable life of 2034. In addition to the  
7 earlier end-of-life date, Bridger will require incremental  
8 investments to maintain operations prior to the  
9 decommissioning of the plant. However, the specific timing  
10 and exact amounts of these future investments are not yet  
11 known. For these reasons, the Company proposes the  
12 establishment of a balancing account that would allow  
13 flexibility for the timing and recovery of the remaining  
14 Bridger revenue requirement.

15          Q.       Has the Commission authorized Idaho Power to  
16 implement the requested recovery treatment in any other  
17 cases?

18          A.       Yes. The Commission approved a cost recovery  
19 approach for incremental annual costs associated with an  
20 early retirement of the Boardman power plant ("Boardman")  
21 with Order No. 32457 and more recently in Order No. 33771  
22 for Valmy. The Company's proposal in this case is  
23 consistent with the cost recovery approach most recently  
24 approved for Valmy in Case No. IPC-E-16-24. In Idaho  
25 Power's experience, these balancing accounts efficiently

1 facilitated investment review and timely rate changes when  
2 necessary to exit coal-fired generation units while  
3 smoothing customer rate impacts.

4 Q. Please provide an overview of Idaho Power's  
5 proposed cost recovery approach.

6 A. There are four types of costs the Company  
7 anticipates recording to the balancing account: (1) the  
8 accelerated depreciation associated with existing Bridger  
9 plant investments, (2) the return on the undepreciated  
10 capital investments at Bridger, (3) non-fuel operations and  
11 maintenance ("O&M") expense reductions, and (4)  
12 decommissioning costs related to the Bridger shutdown.  
13 Under the balancing account approach, the Company replaces  
14 the base rate revenue recovery associated with Idaho  
15 Power's existing investment in Bridger with a levelized  
16 revenue requirement and tracks it in the Bridger balancing  
17 account.

18 Q. What are the benefits associated with this  
19 approach?

20 A. Like the balancing account mechanisms approved  
21 for Boardman in Case No. IPC-E-11-18 and Valmy in Case No.  
22 IPC-E-16-24, the Bridger balancing account is designed to  
23 smooth revenue requirement impacts associated with the exit  
24 of Bridger operations and allow for full recovery of  
25 Bridger-related costs near the time Idaho Power exits plant

1 operations. As discussed earlier, this will effectively  
2 align the cost recovery period with the Company's remaining  
3 participation in Bridger operations, resulting in a better  
4 matching of cost recovery from customers who benefit from  
5 the plant's operations while mitigating the risk of future  
6 customers bearing the costs of a plant that will no longer  
7 be providing service to them. Additionally, through the  
8 proposed accounting treatment, customers will pay no more  
9 or no less than the actual O&M and capital-related costs of  
10 the Bridger plant beginning in 2021.

11 Q. Please describe the tracking of the  
12 accelerated depreciation associated with the Bridger plant  
13 investments.

14 A. The proposed accounting treatment will result  
15 in accelerated depreciation expense related to all Bridger  
16 plant investments as compared to current depreciation that  
17 is based on a retirement date of 2034. Idaho Power is  
18 proposing to track and recover the accelerated depreciation  
19 expense associated with the exit of Bridger operations at  
20 year-end 2030 through the Bridger balancing account as  
21 quantified later in my testimony.

22 Q. Please explain the return on undepreciated  
23 capital investments at Bridger that will be tracked in the  
24 balancing account.

25 A. As the capital investments depreciate at a

1 faster pace due to the accelerated depreciation, the  
2 balancing account captures the savings associated with the  
3 return on the declining undepreciated capital investment  
4 balance. Additionally, although Idaho Power's exit from  
5 Bridger operations is expected to occur by 2030, there will  
6 be required investments at the plant in addition to its  
7 normal maintenance in order to keep the plant operational  
8 until that time. The Company's proposal will result in  
9 accelerated depreciation to all Bridger investments. The  
10 return and associated depreciation expense will be tracked  
11 in the balancing account.

12 Q. What is the Company's proposal for the  
13 tracking of Bridger decommissioning costs?

14 A. As a co-owner in the plant, Idaho Power is  
15 responsible for and will incur decommissioning costs  
16 related to the Bridger plant as units are retired and the  
17 plant reaches its end-of-life. Currently, estimated  
18 decommissioning costs are accounted for as an Asset  
19 Retirement Obligation ("ARO"), which considers future  
20 obligations tied to legally required removal and  
21 remediation activities at the end of the plant's life.  
22 This may include costs to decommission and remove plant  
23 components, including the power plant, associated ponds and  
24 material handling facilities, including a partial offset of  
25 expected salvage proceeds. The Company's current base rates

1 do not include any recovery of AROs related to Bridger.

2 Q. How does Idaho Power account for Bridger  
3 ARO's?

4 A. The Company accounts for Bridger AROs in  
5 accordance with Order No. 29414, in which Idaho Power  
6 records: (1) a regulatory asset for the cumulative  
7 financial statement impact resulting from the Company's  
8 implementation of Accounting Standards Codification ("ASC")  
9 410, and (2) the ongoing annual differences between the ASC  
10 410 depreciation and accretion expenses and the annual  
11 depreciation expenses that are currently authorized by the  
12 Commission in depreciation rates and accruals.

13 Bridger-related ARO balances will continue to be  
14 accounted for using the deferral treatment required by  
15 Order No. 29414, such that the recorded Bridger-related ARO  
16 liabilities will be fully offset by the related regulatory  
17 assets at the time of decommissioning. Revenues collected  
18 from the Bridger levelized revenue requirement, including  
19 future adjustments resulting from changes in  
20 decommissioning estimates and actual costs, will cover the  
21 estimated asset retirement costs and decommissioning.

22 Q. Please describe Idaho Power's accounting order  
23 request necessary to establish the Bridger balancing  
24 account.

25 A. To accomplish a levelized revenue requirement

1 collection period beyond the operational life of some of  
2 the Bridger units, Idaho Power is requesting the Commission  
3 issue an accounting order that allows the Company to make  
4 the needed accounting entries, including a regulatory asset  
5 account, that would allow for the matching of Generally  
6 Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") revenue recognition  
7 and related costs with the actual monthly pattern of the  
8 Bridger revenue requirement from 2021 through 2030 compared  
9 to the levelized collection method and for collection of  
10 decommissioning costs that occur beyond 2030. In addition,  
11 because GAAP and Internal Revenue Code ("IRC") rules will  
12 require the Company to make income tax filings and  
13 accounting entries consistent with the economics that  
14 actually occur (such as an exit from a unit earlier than  
15 2030) rather than the levelized assumption, the regulatory  
16 account(s) are required to adjust the financial statement  
17 impacts resulting from the timing of Bridger-related GAAP  
18 accounting and income tax results as compared to the 2030  
19 levelized ratemaking assumption.

20 Q. Does Idaho Power have any additional requests  
21 with respect to the accounting associated with the  
22 establishment of the Bridger balancing account?

23 A. Yes. If approved, the balancing account will  
24 allow the income tax calculations to reflect the new  
25 recovery period through 2030 but also will maintain

1 compliance with the IRC normalization rules for accelerated  
2 depreciation. Historically the Company did not track  
3 accumulated deferred income taxes ("ADIT") and reversing  
4 flow-through differences by specific plant, therefore  
5 Company used a tax accounting system generated  
6 estimated amount of ADIT for the numbers included in the  
7 2011 test year for Bridger for this case. Because the same  
8 methodology was used with the establishment of the Boardman  
9 and Valmy balancing accounts, and as agreed to in the  
10 Settlement Stipulation approved with Order No. 33771 in  
11 Case No. IPC-E-16-24, Idaho Power's income tax calculations  
12 in this case include the remaining balance of flow-through  
13 differences and ADIT related to the thermal plant tax  
14 accounting group.

15 Q. Does the accounting order request have an  
16 impact on amounts proposed to be included in customer  
17 rates?

18 A. No. The proposed accounting order does not  
19 have any effect on customer rates for the existing Bridger  
20 capital investment but will allow the Company to match  
21 revenues with the costs that it is incurring. However, if  
22 approved, the Bridger levelized revenue requirement  
23 mechanism would, as discussed later in my testimony.

24 **IV. THE BRIDGER LEVELIZED REVENUE REQUIREMENT MECHANISM**

25 Q. How is the levelized revenue requirement

1 determined?

2           A.       The levelized revenue requirement is  
3 determined by calculating the present value of the revenue  
4 requirement of each of the individual balancing account  
5 items and converting the values into a level payment stream  
6 from customers over the remaining recovery period. It  
7 includes the costs of accelerating the depreciation of the  
8 Bridger plant items, the return associated with capital  
9 investments net of accumulated depreciation forecasted  
10 through Idaho Power's participation in operations of  
11 Bridger, decommissioning costs associated with Bridger's  
12 end-of-life, and O&M savings associated with non-fuel O&M  
13 reductions.

14           Q.       Has Idaho Power determined the levelized  
15 revenue requirement associated with the costs proposed to  
16 be tracked in the Bridger balancing account?

17           A.       Yes. Exhibit No. 1 details the development of  
18 the levelized revenue requirement. Under the methodology  
19 described earlier in my testimony, the annual levelized  
20 revenue requirement associated with recovery of Bridger on  
21 an accelerated basis is \$67.79 million on an Idaho  
22 jurisdictional basis. As can be seen in Exhibit No. 1,  
23 Idaho Power has separated the levelized revenue requirement  
24 into three components: (1) Component A - the revenue  
25 requirement on Bridger investments, (2) Component B - the

1 revenue requirement associated with interim future  
2 decommissioning costs, and (3) Component C - the revenue  
3 requirement associated with O&M savings including non-fuel  
4 O&M reductions.

5 **Revenue Requirement on Bridger Investments (Component A)**

6 Q. Please describe the quantification of  
7 Component A - the revenue requirement on Bridger  
8 investments.

9 A. Component A includes the declining revenue  
10 requirement on the existing Bridger investments as of  
11 December 31, 2020, as well as the forecasted incremental  
12 investments anticipated to be made between the January 1,  
13 2021, through December 31, 2030. As previously mentioned,  
14 concurrent with this filing, Idaho Power has filed its  
15 updated depreciation study in Case No. IPC-E-21-18. In  
16 that filing, the Company is proposing to exclude the  
17 impacts of the accelerated depreciation for Bridger and  
18 instead track these incremental expenses in the Bridger  
19 balancing account proposed in this case. As of December  
20 31, 2020, the Bridger net plant investment is approximately  
21 \$369.58 million and the forecasted incremental investments  
22 expected through December 31, 2030, are approximately  
23 \$95.05 million, resulting in a total levelized revenue  
24 requirement associated with Component A of \$73.47 million  
25 on an Idaho jurisdictional basis.

1 Q. How were the total forecasted incremental  
2 investments of \$95.05 million determined?

3 A. The starting point for quantification of the  
4 forecasted incremental investments was the Bridger capital  
5 forecast for plant investments through December 31, 2030.  
6 Applying Idaho Power's one-third ownership share, the  
7 Company then assumed that the cost responsibility of the  
8 incremental investments ceased at the point that  
9 participation of operations in a Bridger unit ended.

10 Q. What dates did Idaho Power assume for ceasing  
11 participation in operations at each of the Bridger units?

12 A. Idaho Power modeled the end of participation  
13 in each Bridger unit consistent with the Preferred  
14 Portfolio from the Second Amended 2019 IRP, acknowledged by  
15 the Commission in Order No. 34959, with the exception of  
16 the exit from the first unit. The Preferred Portfolio  
17 included exit dates of 2022, 2026, 2028, and 2030 for the  
18 four units at Bridger. However, due to issues associated  
19 with regional market access and other resource adequacy  
20 concerns as discussed in the Company's filing related to  
21 the appropriate shutdown date for Valmy Unit 2 in Case No.  
22 IPC-E-21-12, the Company's cost forecast is modeled based  
23 on exiting the first Bridger unit in 2025, consistent with  
24 the expected online date of the Boardman-to-Hemingway  
25 transmission line in the summer of 2026.

1 Q. Based on these assumed exit dates, how are  
2 common facility investments addressed in the forecast?

3 A. It is assumed that Idaho Power will continue  
4 to be responsible for its one-third share of common  
5 facility investments through 2030.

6 Q. Did Idaho Power make any additional  
7 adjustments to the capital forecast?

8 A. Yes. Idaho Power removed from the forecast  
9 large capital expenditures associated with the overhaul of  
10 Units 3 and 4 in 2028 and 2029, respectively. The direct  
11 testimony of Company witness Ryan N. Adelman will summarize  
12 the forecasted projects and why they are necessary for  
13 environmental compliance or the continued safe, reliable  
14 operations of Bridger.

15 Q. Why did the Company remove expected capital  
16 investments associated with Units 3 and 4?

17 A. Mr. Adelman's testimony describes in detail  
18 what an overhaul entails, but Idaho Power believes it is  
19 too early to determine if the overhaul will be required  
20 because the units will be approaching their end-of-life. As  
21 the Bridger capital forecast is updated annually and the  
22 plant nears its end-of-life, the Company will continually  
23 reevaluate inclusion of future forecasted investments.

1 Q. Do PacifiCorp and Idaho Power have an  
2 agreement for cost responsibility should one or both  
3 parties exit participation in operations of a Bridger unit?

4 A. No. Mr. Adelman will describe the existing  
5 Bridger contractual agreements between Idaho Power and  
6 PacifiCorp and planned coordination towards an agreement  
7 that allows for the early exit from Bridger units. While  
8 the Company has estimated the forecasted investments based  
9 on information known at this time, Idaho Power's proposed  
10 balancing account will track actual costs and benefits  
11 associated with the plant, ensuring customers pay no more  
12 or no less than actual Bridger-related costs once an exit  
13 agreement is finalized.

14 Q. What level of return on equity ("ROE") has the  
15 Company incorporated into the revenue requirement  
16 quantifications?

17 A. Consistent with the treatment of Boardman-  
18 related revenue requirement computations and current  
19 treatment of Valmy-related revenue requirement  
20 computations, Idaho Power proposes to use a 9.5 percent ROE  
21 in the quantification of the levelized revenue requirement  
22 for Bridger. In case No. IPC-E-11-18, the Commission  
23 agreed with Commission Staff's proposal to use a 9.5  
24 percent ROE to calculate levelized payments for Boardman.  
25 Because the regulatory treatment request in this case

1 mirrors that applied for recovery of both Boardman and  
2 Valmy plant investments, the Company believes it is  
3 reasonable and appropriate to apply the same ROE to Bridger  
4 investments.

5 **Revenue Requirement of Interim Future Decommissioning Costs**

6 **(Component B)**

7 Q. What is the Company's quantification of  
8 Component B - the revenue requirement associated with  
9 interim future decommissioning costs?

10 A. Idaho Power estimated its share of the  
11 decommissioning costs by applying the Company's one-third  
12 ownership percentage to the decommissioning and demolition  
13 study performed by Kiewit Engineering Group Inc.  
14 ("Kiewit"). In August 2019, PacifiCorp retained Kiewit to  
15 evaluate seven coal-fired power plants, including Bridger,  
16 and develop a Class 3 capital cost estimate for  
17 decommissioning and demolition. This estimate was the  
18 basis for the Bridger decommissioning costs included in the  
19 levelized revenue requirement computation.

20 Q. Has Idaho Power included any contingency  
21 estimates in the decommissioning costs?

22 A. No. Similar to decommissioning cost estimates  
23 recovered through the Boardman and Valmy levelized revenue  
24 requirement mechanisms, the Company has excluded any

1 contingency amounts from the Bridger decommissioning cost  
2 estimate.

3 Q. Did Idaho Power make any adjustments to the  
4 decommissioning and demolition cost estimate developed by  
5 Kiewit?

6 A. Yes. Due to the magnitude of the Company's  
7 share of the estimated decommissioning costs, \$105.81  
8 million on an Idaho jurisdictional basis, Idaho Power has  
9 only included in the levelized revenue requirement  
10 quantification amounts associated with the decommissioning  
11 costs expected to be incurred prior to year-end 2030.  
12 Based on both Idaho Power and PacifiCorp's Bridger unit  
13 early exit assumptions, it is anticipated that both parties  
14 will have exited two Bridger units at that time and that  
15 decommissioning of the two units has commenced. The  
16 Company has quantified an estimate of Idaho Power's share  
17 of the expenditures associated with decommissioning of the  
18 two units, approximately \$660,000, and included that in the  
19 levelized revenue requirement computation.

20 Q. What is the Company's proposal for recovery of  
21 the remaining \$105.14 million?

22 A. Idaho Power is proposing to begin collection  
23 of the remaining decommissioning costs beginning January 1,  
24 2031, or when the Company has exited operations of the  
25 Bridger plant. This approach more closely aligns the

1 timing of amounts spent on decommissioning activities with  
2 the recovery of the decommissioning expenditures.

3 Q. When does Idaho Power anticipate recovery of  
4 decommissioning costs will cease?

5 A. Maintaining collections from customers at the  
6 proposed levelized Bridger revenue requirement levels  
7 beginning January 1, 2031, or approximately \$67.79 million  
8 annually, would result in full recovery of decommissioning  
9 costs by mid-2032. The Company's proposal will help smooth  
10 the recovery of all Bridger-related costs, extending the  
11 collection period only one and a half years and minimizing  
12 the financial impact to both Idaho Power and its customers.

13 Q. What is the total levelized revenue  
14 requirement of Component B - the revenue requirement  
15 associated with interim future decommissioning costs?

16 A. The levelized revenue requirement associated  
17 with Component B - interim future decommissioning costs, is  
18 \$59,318 on an Idaho jurisdictional basis.

19 **Revenue Requirement of O&M Savings (Component C)**

20 Q. Please describe the quantification of  
21 Component C - the revenue requirement associated with O&M  
22 savings including non-fuel O&M reductions.

23 A. In Case No. IPC-E-16-24, the Commission  
24 approved a levelized revenue requirement that included  
25 expected non-fuel O&M savings when compared to Valmy-

1 related non-fuel O&M amounts approved in the Company's last  
2 general rate case. Idaho Power committed to, as part of  
3 the Settlement Stipulation approved with Order No. 33771,  
4 make a forecast-to-actual adjustment of the non-fuel O&M  
5 savings in the next Valmy-related adjustment to rates,  
6 subsequently truing-up to actuals the Valmy non-fuel O&M  
7 included in customer rates with Order No. 34349. Idaho  
8 Power is proposing the same reduction to the Bridger  
9 levelized revenue requirement in this case.

10 Q. How did the Company compute the estimated  
11 Bridger O&M savings?

12 A. Idaho Power has included a comparison of  
13 estimated Bridger 2011 test year non-fuel O&M amounts to  
14 the forecast of non-fuel O&M expected at Bridger through  
15 2030. Because the Company does not have a contractual  
16 agreement with PacifiCorp for cost responsibilities once a  
17 unit is exited, Idaho Power has assumed that variable O&M  
18 ceases upon exit but that the Company is responsible for  
19 fixed O&M as long as PacifiCorp is operating the unit. The  
20 levelized revenue requirement calculation assumes all O&M  
21 cost responsibilities cease in 2030.

22 Q. What is the total non-fuel O&M savings  
23 included in the levelized revenue requirement computation?

24 A. Idaho Power is proposing to include in the  
25 levelized revenue requirement non-fuel O&M savings of

1 approximately \$5.74 million on an Idaho jurisdictional  
2 basis.

3 Q. What is the resulting total levelized revenue  
4 requirement?

5 A. The levelized revenue requirement associated  
6 with Bridger includes \$73.47 million associated with plant  
7 investments, \$0.06 million in decommissioning costs, and  
8 \$5.74 million in non-fuel O&M savings, for a total annual  
9 levelized revenue requirement of \$67,793,544 on an Idaho  
10 jurisdictional basis.

11 Q. What is the existing revenue requirement  
12 associated with Bridger that is currently included in the  
13 Company's base rates?

14 A. Exhibit No. 2 details the derivation of the  
15 Idaho jurisdictional share of the Bridger revenue  
16 requirement based on a 2011 test year, as approved in Case  
17 No. IPC-E-11-08 with Order No. 32481, the Company's last  
18 general rate case. In addition, Idaho Power has included  
19 an adjustment to reflect Bridger revenue requirement  
20 amounts returned to customers in Case No. GNR-U-18-01 with  
21 Order No. 34071 as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of  
22 2017. The existing revenue requirement associated with  
23 Bridger and currently included in the Company's base rates  
24 is \$36,967,815. If Idaho Power's proposal is approved,  
25 this amount will be replaced with the levelized revenue

1 requirement amount detailed in Exhibit No. 1.

2 Q. How does the total levelized revenue  
3 requirement compare to the existing levelized revenue  
4 requirement currently in customer rates?

5 A. The total Idaho jurisdictional levelized  
6 revenue requirement of \$67.79 million less the Idaho  
7 jurisdictional share of the existing revenue requirement of  
8 \$36.97 million, results in an incremental annual levelized  
9 revenue requirement of approximately \$30.83 million on an  
10 Idaho jurisdictional basis.

11 **V. PROPOSED RATEMAKING TREATMENT**

12 Q. Does the Company plan to administer the  
13 Bridger balancing account with an annual review - the same  
14 way it did the Boardman balancing account and does  
15 currently with the Valmy balancing account?

16 A. Yes. Idaho Power is proposing to administer  
17 the Bridger balancing account the same way it currently  
18 administers the Valmy balancing account. On an annual  
19 basis, the Company will recalculate the levelized revenue  
20 requirement for Bridger based upon actual O&M expenses and  
21 capital investments to date and an updated forecast of  
22 future investments and O&M savings at the plant. In  
23 addition, monthly deviations between forecasted revenue  
24 collection and actual revenue collection will be tracked  
25 and, along with the revised levelized revenue requirement

1 calculation, combined to determine whether a rate  
2 adjustment is needed. If the Company determines that a  
3 rate adjustment is needed, a request would be filed with  
4 the Commission with the revised levelized revenue  
5 requirement. Should Idaho Power choose not to recommend an  
6 adjustment to rates in a given year, amounts previously  
7 recorded in the balancing account would remain in the  
8 balancing account for future recovery or refund. Under  
9 this approach, customers will pay only actual Bridger-  
10 related costs, no more and no less.

11 Q. How does the Company propose to allocate the  
12 incremental annual levelized revenue requirement amount of  
13 approximately \$30.83 million to each class of customers?

14 A. Idaho Power requests that the incremental  
15 revenue requirement of approximately \$30.83 million be  
16 recovered from all customer classes through a uniform  
17 percentage increase to all base rate components except the  
18 service charge.

19 Q. Has the Company prepared a schedule that  
20 presents the revenue spread results for each customer class  
21 under Idaho Power's proposed allocation methodology?

22 A. Yes. Attachment No. 1 to the Application  
23 presents a summary of the proposed revenue impact for each  
24 customer class. In addition, Attachment No. 2 to the  
25 Application presents a summary of the combined revenue

1 impact for each customer class of the Company's request in  
2 this case and the request filed concurrently in Case No.  
3 IPC-E-21-18.

4 Q. Why does the Company believe the proposed  
5 December 1, 2021, effective date for the requested rate  
6 adjustments is reasonable and appropriate?

7 A. As explained earlier, through preparations of  
8 the updated depreciation study, Idaho Power identified  
9 that significant changes had occurred with regard to the  
10 economic life of the Bridger plant, warranting the need  
11 for specific review separate from the Company's general  
12 depreciation filing. Given the requirement to file an  
13 updated depreciation study, Idaho Power believes it is  
14 appropriate to consider Bridger-related issues  
15 concurrently with the comprehensive depreciation study. In  
16 addition, a Bridger balancing account mechanism smooths  
17 the revenue requirement impact over the time during which  
18 Idaho Power participates in operations, providing  
19 stability for customers. The proposed mechanism converts  
20 revenue requirement amounts into a level payment stream  
21 over the recovery period, ensuring customers pay no more  
22 or no less than actual Bridger-related costs. Under this  
23 approach, should any differences ultimately impact the  
24 allowed levels of recovery, a true-up could be made during  
25 the next update to Bridger-related base rates.

1 **VI. CONCLUSION**

2 Q. Please summarize your testimony.

3 A. Idaho Power is proposing to accelerate the  
4 depreciation schedule for the Bridger plant to reflect the  
5 Company's exit from participation in operations by year-end  
6 2030. The proposal will smooth the revenue requirement  
7 impacts associated with the accelerated depreciation and  
8 result in the appropriate matching of cost recovery with  
9 Idaho Power's participation in plant operations. In  
10 addition, the Company's proposal mitigates future rate  
11 increases required if Bridger's depreciable life is not  
12 updated and minimizes the rate impact to customers at this  
13 time.

14 Additionally, Bridger will require incremental  
15 investments to maintain environmental compliance and safe,  
16 reliable operations prior to decommissioning the plant.  
17 However, the specific timing and exact amounts of these  
18 future investments are not yet known. For that reason,  
19 Idaho Power proposes the establishment of a balancing  
20 account that would allow flexibility for the timing and  
21 recovery of the remaining Bridger revenue requirement. The  
22 requested treatment is consistent with the currently  
23 approved methodology related to the early closure of Valmy,  
24 which has proven to be an effective method to provide for  
25 cost recovery while smoothing out rate impacts to

1 customers. Under the proposed methodology, Idaho Power  
2 seeks approval of an adjustment of \$30,825,729 to the  
3 Company's Idaho jurisdictional revenue requirement to take  
4 place on December 1, 2021, which equates to an overall  
5 increase of 2.53 percent.

6 Q. Does this complete your testimony?

7 A. Yes, it does.

8

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**DECLARATION OF MATTHEW T. LARKIN**

I, Matthew T. Larkin, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Idaho:

1. My name is Matthew T. Larkin. I am employed by Idaho Power Company as the Revenue Requirement Senior Manager.

2. On behalf of Idaho Power, I present this pre-filed direct testimony and Exhibit Nos. 1-2 in this matter.

3. To the best of my knowledge, my pre-filed direct testimony and exhibit are true and accurate.

I hereby declare that the above statement is true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that I understand it is made for use as evidence before the Idaho Public Utilities Commission and is subject to penalty for perjury.

SIGNED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of June 2021, at Boise, Idaho.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Matthew T. Larkin

**BEFORE THE  
IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**CASE NO. IPC-E-21-17**

**IDAHO POWER COMPANY**

**LARKIN  
TESTIMONY**

**EXHIBIT NO. 1**

## Levelized Revenue Requirement for the Bridger Plant at December 31, 2020

**Total System**

Levelized Annual Revenue Requirement Effective December 1, 2021

Component A	Component B	Component C	
Plant Investments	Interim Decommissioning Costs	O&M Variance	
\$ 77,270,023	\$ 62,385	\$ (6,035,475)	\$ 71,296,932

**Idaho Jurisdictional**

Levelized Annual Revenue Requirement Effective December 1, 2021

Component A	Component B	Component C	
Plant Investments	Interim Decommissioning Costs	O&M Variance	
\$ 73,470,945	\$ 59,318	\$ (5,736,719)	\$ 67,793,544

Current Bridger Revenue Requirement included in Rates  
Net Change in Bridger Levelized Revenue Requirement

	36,967,815
	\$ 30,825,729

**BEFORE THE  
IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**CASE NO. IPC-E-21-17**

**IDAHO POWER COMPANY**

**LARKIN  
TESTIMONY**

**EXHIBIT NO. 2**

Idaho Power Company  
Summary of Revenue Requirement - Idaho  
Bridger: 2011 Test Year

**RATE BASE**

<hr/>	
Electric Plant in Service	
Intangible Plant	\$ 472,935
Production Plant	496,870,248
Transmission Plant	12,256,076
Distribution Plant	0
General Plant	2,285,921
Total Electric Plant in Service	\$ 511,885,180
Less: Accumulated Depreciation	264,093,186
Less: Amortization of Other Plant	0
Net Electric Plant in Service	\$ 247,791,994
Less: Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes	26,749,509
<b>TOTAL COMBINED RATE BASE</b>	<b><u><u>\$ 221,042,485</u></u></b>

**NET INCOME**

<hr/>	
Total Operating Revenues	\$ -
Operating Expenses	
Operation and Maintenance Expenses	
Depreciation Expenses	12,289,001
Amortization of Limited Term Plant	
Taxes Other Than Income	1,562,026
Regulatory Debits/Credits	
Provision for Deferred Income Taxes	5,386,201
Investment Tax Credit Adjustment	
Current Income Taxes	(12,511,880)
Total Operating Expenses	\$ 6,725,349
<b>Consolidated Operating Income</b>	<b><u><u>\$ (6,725,349)</u></u></b>
Proposed Rate of Return	7.86%
Earnings Deficiency	\$ 24,099,288
Net-to-Gross Tax Multiplier	1.642
<b>Bridger Revenue Requirement (IPC-E-11-08)</b>	<b><u><u>\$ 39,571,031</u></u></b>
<b>Bridger Revenue Requirement Reduction (GNR-U-18-01)</b>	<b><u><u>\$ (2,603,216)</u></u></b>
<b>Bridger Revenue Requirement Currently in Rates</b>	<b><u><u>\$ 36,967,815</u></u></b>